



Application No.:10/625,700

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Shinya TAGUCHI et al.

Group Art Unit: 2179

Application No.: 10/625,700

Examiner: N. AUGUSTINE

Filed: July 24, 2003

Docket No.: 116678

For: IMAGE PROCESSING SYSTEM

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. Review of the February 4, 2010 Office Action is requested for the reasons set forth in the attached five or fewer sheets.

Should any questions arise regarding this submission, or the Review Panel believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Review Panel is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:VVR/hs

Date: May 4, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 15-25 are pending in this application. The Office Action now rejects claims 1-3, 5-12 and 15-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281 (Chen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,435 (Vigneaux) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,203,380 (Chiu). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

I. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

The applied references fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious "at least one designated item correlated with the video are stored with keyword searchable data of at least one of (iii) text data of the presentation document and (iv) voice index data of the video data for each still picture," as recited by independent claims 1 and 2.

The Office Action alleges that Vigneaux discloses the above-quoted features. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that Vigneaux discloses at col. 4, lines 4-23 and col. 6, lines 5-19 and 41-67 storing keyword searchable data for each object wherein data objects consist of graphics, textm video audio. Further, the Office Action alleges that Vigneaux discloses at col. 2, lines 22-34 that Vigneaux's search methods are combinable with Chen's system for presentation of multimedia objects because Vigneaux allegedly discloses a user-friendly graphical interface. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Vigneaux discloses at col. 2, lines 22-34 that a storyboard may include text created by the user while creating the storyboard, graphics, audio, still pictures and other form of multimedia data. Thus, because Vigneaux merely discloses an attached storyboard with text and other multimedia, Vigneaux does not disclose keyword searchable data of at least voice index data of the video data for each still picture.

Vigneaux discloses at col. 4, lines 4-23 an asset manager 360 contains search support data for locating media objects stored media server, the near-line storage system and in the off-line storage system. Further, Vigneaux discloses at col. 7, lines 27-28 that a video

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 15-25 are pending in this application. The Office Action now rejects claims 1-3, 5-12 and 15-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281 (Chen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,435 (Vigneaux) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,203,380 (Chiu). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

I. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

The applied references fail to disclose and would not have rendered obvious "at least one designated item correlated with the video are stored with keyword searchable data of at least one of (iii) text data of the presentation document and (iv) voice index data of the video data for each still picture," as recited by independent claims 1 and 2.

The Office Action alleges that Vigneaux discloses the above-quoted features. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that Vigneaux discloses at col. 4, lines 4-23 and col. 6, lines 5-19 and 41-67 storing keyword searchable data for each object wherein data objects consist of graphics, text, video, audio. Further, the Office Action alleges that Vigneaux discloses at col. 2, lines 22-34 that Vigneaux's search methods are combinable with Chen's system for presentation of multimedia objects because Vigneaux allegedly discloses a user-friendly graphical interface. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Vigneaux discloses at col. 2, lines 22-34 that a storyboard may include text created by the user while creating the storyboard, graphics, audio, still pictures and other form of multimedia data. Thus, because Vigneaux merely discloses an attached storyboard with text and other multimedia, Vigneaux does not disclose keyword searchable data of at least voice index data of the video data for each still picture.

Vigneaux discloses at col. 4, lines 4-23 an asset manager 360 contains search support data for locating media objects stored media server, the near-line storage system and in the off-line storage system. Further, Vigneaux discloses at col. 7, lines 27-28 that a video

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Information Disclosure Statements filed

Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement and consideration of the references filed in an Information Disclosure Statements on January 29, 2008, April 1, 2008 and March 19, 2009.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should anything further be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth above.